UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/642,998	08/18/2003	John D. Hatlestad	GUID.058PA	2963	
	7590 05/23/2007 ORTH & FUNK, LLC	EXAMINER			
8009 34TH AVE S.			CRABTREE, JOSHUA DAVID		
SUITE 125 MINNEAPOLI	S. MN 55425		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Advisory Action	
n ra	the Filing of an Anneal	Rriof

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/642,998	HATLESTAD ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Joshua D. Crabtree	3714		

	Joshua D. Crabtree	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL		•	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Nor a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further control (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a company NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12,14 and 35-56. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consider because: (See Continuation Sheet).	ered but does NOT place the applic	cation in condition for	allowance
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	KATHLEE	N MOSSER
		JDC PRIMARY	EXAMINER
			•

Claims 1-12, 12, and 35-56 will remain rejected under the same grounds presented in the previous office action. Applicant has argued that the prior art does not show the feature of detecting at least one non-physiological condition associated with the sleep quality of a patient, the non-physiological condition comprising an ambient condition external to the patient other than time (p. 9). The examiner refers applicant to the previously cited passage of Sullivan (Col. 3:3-13), which teaches the detection of background noise as part of a method of detecting sleep apnea. Background noise would constitute an ambient condition, external to the patient. For example, the hum from a ceiling fan would constitute background noise. The noise from a ceiling fan would certainly be non-physiological, and would certainly be external to the patient. Furthermore, the specification of the instant application even recites ambient noise as an example of a non-physiological condition (p. 13). The applicant has made arguments pertaining to what the prior art does with the detected noise, as compared with the applicant's invention (pp. 9-10). The examiner reminds applicant that the claim recites the step of "detecting" a non-physiological condition. Sullivan teaches "detecting" a non-physiological condition (background noise), and therefore very clearly reads on the claimed limitation. The examiner has not imported additional limitations from the specification into the claim.